



05-14-03

HPO 21
03
5/20/03
5/20/03
mel

EXPRESS MAIL CERTIFICATE

5/12/03

Date Label No.

I hereby certify that, on the date indicated above, this paper or fee was
positively delivered to the U.S. Postal Service & that it was addressed
to the Mail Stop AF, Honorable Commissioner for Patents
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 by "Express Mail Post Office to Address
Service".

D. Davis

D. Davis

Name (Print)

Signature

PLEASE CHARGE ANY DEFICIENCY UP
TO \$300.00 OR CREDIT ANY EXCESS
IN THE FEES DUE WITH THIS
DOCUMENT TO OUR DEPOSIT
ACCOUNT NO. 04-0100

Customer No.:

Dkt. No. 6727/0H449



07278

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Application of : HERZBERG et al.

Serial No.: 09/625,006

: Group Art Unit: 3621

Filed : July 25, 2000

: Examiner: Kambiz Abdi

For : MICRO PAYMENT-BASED ADVERTISING

May 12, 2003

Mail Stop AF
Honorable Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

RECEIVED

MAY 16 2003

GROUP 3600

Sir:

In response to an Interview Summary prepared by the
Examiner with regard to a telephone interview held with
applicant's representative, Daniel Kligler (Reg. No.

41,120), mailed on April 28, 2003, applicant submits the following remarks.

In the Interview Summary prepared by the Examiner, it is stated that applicant's representative "agreed that claim 1 has been overcome by the prior art." Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner misunderstood the substance of certain comments made by applicant's representative, and that no admission whatsoever was made as to non-patentability of any of the claims. Rather, in view of the final rejection of all the claims in the application and in an effort to reach agreement on patentability of at least some of the claims before having to resort to a continuation or appeal, applicant suggested that claim 1 be set aside, and that the interview focus on claim 10 as a possible basis for agreement.

With respect to claim 10, the discussion during the interview centered mainly on the use of aliases by Barber (U.S. Patent 6,157,917), including the sample database of aliases presented by Barber in his Table 2. Applicant pointed out that Barber provides only a single alias for each target Web page, and does not suggest that the aliases are specific to a particular advertiser among a plurality of advertisers, as required by claim 10. The Examiner was not convinced by this argument as to the patentability of claim 10.

The substance of applicant's arguments is further summarized and expanded upon in the remarks to the amendment filed April 28, 2003.

Respectfully submitted,



S. Peter Ludwig
Registration No. 25,351
Attorney for Applicant

Darby & Darby P.C.
805 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022
(212) 527-7700